

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

MICHAEL L. HAAS,
Plaintiff,

v.

**WARDEN, ROSS CORRECTIONAL
INSTITUTION,**
Defendant.

Case No. 2:13-cv-31

**Judge Peter C. Economus
ORDER**

This matter is before the Court for consideration of the July 5, 2013 Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. (Dkt. 10.) The Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court dismiss this action. He found that Petitioner's Ground Two, a claim that the verdict was against the manifest weight of the evidence, cannot be considered on the merits in an action for habeas corpus relief filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The Magistrate Judge found no merit in Petitioner's Grounds One, Three, and Four; for insufficiency of the evidence, prosecutorial misconduct, and ineffective assistance of counsel, respectively.

The Report and Recommendation specifically advised the parties that failure to object to the Report and Recommendation within fourteen days results in a "waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the District Judge and waiver of the right to appeal the judgment of the District Court." (Dkt. 10 at 26.) The Magistrate Judge granted Petitioner's motion for an extension of time to file objections, ordering that objections be filed no later than August 19, 2013. More than two weeks following this deadline, Petitioner has filed neither objections nor a second motion for an extension.

The Court reviewed the Report and Recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Finding the Report and Recommendation to be well-reasoned, and noting that no objections have

been filed and that the time for filing such objections has expired, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, Plaintiff's action is **DISMISSED**, and the Clerk is **DIRECTED** to remove this action from the Court's pending case list.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE